

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

By the present amendment, claims 1, 8, 29, 43, 49 and 53 are amended, and claim 7 is canceled. Claims 1 – 6 and 8 - 56 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 20, 29, 43 and 49 being independent.

Applicant has carefully considered the contents of the Office Action and respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of the subject application in view of the explanations noted below.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 7, 10, 14 – 16, 18 – 19, 20, 24 – 28, and 49 - 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,639,841 to Salestrom. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, since the Salestrom patent clearly does not disclose, teach or render obvious the subject matter of independent claim 1.

Independent claim 1 recites, inter alia, a low voltage luminaire assembly having a transformer that has power supply and output fittings that are push-in wiring terminals and a lamp holder having power supply and output connectors that are push-in wiring terminals.

Independent claim 20 recites, inter alia, a light assembly having a transformer that has power supply and output fittings that are push-in wiring terminals.

Independent claim 49 recites, inter alia, a lighting assembly having a lamp holder having power supply and output connectors that are push-in wiring terminals.

U.S. Patent No. 4,639,841 to Salestrom (the Salestrom '841 patent) discloses a modular lighting system 10, as shown in FIG. 3. A transformer 46 is provided power through wire 48 and supplies power through wire 52. The transformer 46 has a male connector (plug) 44 and a female connector 50 that are connected to the transformer by the wires 48 and 52, respectively. The lighting module 18 has a male plug portion 22 from which connector elements 24 protrude at a first end and a corresponding female plug portion 26 at a second end, as shown in FIGS. 3 and 4. The male plug portion 22 of the lighting module is either plugged into the female connector 50 of the transformer or into a corresponding socket 28 of another lighting module 18. A plurality of lighting modules 18 may be connected to one another in an end-to-end relationship by the male and corresponding female portions of each lighting module. A light harness 56 may be used to connect light modules 18. Thus, the

Salestrom lighting system requires a plug and socket style connection between the various components of the system. Thus, there is no motivation or suggestion to modify the Salestrom lighting system to have a transformer and lamp holders that have push-in wiring terminals, such that wires between the various components may be quickly and easily removed, as recited in independent claims 1, 20 and 49.

Furthermore, the Salestrom '841 patent does not disclose a power supply and output fittings for the transformer that receive ends of wires to form push-in wiring connections, or a lamp holder having power supply and output connectors that receive ends of wires to form push-in wiring connections. As discussed above, all the connections between the various components of the Salestrom lighting system are plug and socket connections. The Salestrom '841 patent does not disclose a push-in wiring connection between any component of the lighting system. Therefore, the Salestrom '841 patent does not anticipate or render obvious independent claims 1, 20 and 49, and their respective dependent claims 2 – 6, 8 – 19, 21 – 28 and 50 - 56.

Lacking elements recited in independent claims 1, 20 and 49, the Salestrom '841 patent does not anticipate claims 1, 20 and 49 since a “claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Furthermore, one of the stated objectives of the Salestrom '841 patent is to provide light module that are “connected together in an end-to-end relationship to achieve the desired length.” Col. 1, lines 13 – 16. Thus, the light modules 18 of the Salestrom '841 patent cannot be modified to have push-in wiring terminals because the light modules 18 having push-in wiring terminals could not be connected together in an end-to-end relationship, thereby defeating a stated objective of the Salestrom '841 patent. There is no suggestion to modify a prior art device where the modification would render the device inoperable for its intended purpose. In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Thus, in the absence of motivation or suggestion to modify the light modules of the Salestrom '481 patent to have push-in wiring terminals, there is also no motivation or suggestion to modify the transformer to have push-in wiring terminals. Therefore, the Salestrom '841 patent does not anticipate or render obvious independent claims 1, 20 and 49.

Claims 2 – 6, 8 - 19, 21 – 28 and 50 - 56 being dependent upon independent claims 1, 20 and 49, respectively, are also allowable for the above reasons. Moreover, these dependent claims recite additional features further distinguishing them over the cited patents, such as the transformer having a mountable side adapted to mount the transformer to an object of claims 5, 22 and 50; a dimmer switch connected to the electrical power supply wire of claim 12; and the supply and output fittings have means for releasing one of the respective ends of the electrical power supply and output wires of claim 16. Therefore, dependent claims 2 – 6, 8 - 19, 21 – 28 and 50 - 56 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited patents, particularly within the overall claimed combination.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In paragraphs 28 – 38, claims 2 – 6, 8, 9 and 11 - 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Salestrom '841 patent in view of Hatch (non-patent literature). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, since the Salestrom patent in view of the Hatch literature clearly do not disclose, teach or render obvious the subject matter of independent claim.

The Hatch reference is cited for disclosing a transformer having an electronic short circuit and over load protection. However, the Hatch reference does not cure the deficiencies noted above with regard to the Salestrom patent, i.e., the absence of a transformer and a lamp holder having push-in wiring terminals. Therefore, the Salestrom patent and Hatch reference do not disclose or render obvious the claimed features of Applicant's invention as recited in independent claim 1, or its respective dependent claims 2 – 6, 8, 9 and 11 - 13.

In paragraph 39, claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Salestrom '841 patent in view of Hatch (non-patent literature) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 2,713,668 to Gibilisco. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, since the Salestrom patent in view of the Hatch literature and in further view of the Gibilisco patent clearly do not disclose, teach or render obvious the subject matter of independent claim.

The Hatch reference is cited for disclosing a transformer having an electronic short circuit and over load protection. The Gibilisco patent is cited for disclosing an electrical

connector having a quick-release button. However, the Hatch reference and the Gibilisco patent do not cure the deficiencies noted above with regard to the Salestrom patent, i.e., the absence of a transformer and a lamp holder having push-in wiring terminals. Therefore, the Salestrom and Gibilisco patents and the Hatch reference do not disclose or render obvious the claimed features of Applicant's invention as recited in independent claim 1, or its respective dependent claim 17.

In paragraphs 40 - 43, claims 21 - 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Salestrom '841 patent in view of Hatch (non-patent literature). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, since the Salestrom patent in view of the Hatch literature clearly do not disclose, teach or render obvious the subject matter of independent claim.

The Hatch reference is cited for disclosing a transformer having an electronic short circuit and over load protection. However, the Hatch reference does not cure the deficiencies noted above with regard to the Salestrom patent, i.e., the absence of a transformer and a lamp holder having push-in wiring terminals. Therefore, the Salestrom patent and the Hatch reference do not disclose or render obvious the claimed features of Applicant's invention as recited in independent claim 20, or its respective dependent claims 21 - 23.

In paragraphs 44 - 54, claims 29 - 36 and 39 - 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Salestrom '841 patent. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, since the Salestrom patent clearly does not disclose, teach or render obvious the subject matter of independent claim.

Independent claim 29 recites, inter alia, a method for installing a low voltage luminaire assembly in which a lead wire from a lamp holder is connected to a push-in wiring quick-release fitting of the transformer. As discussed above, the Salestrom '841 patent does not disclose or suggest providing any component of its lighting system with a push-in wiring connection. Furthermore, no wires are connected to any of the components of the Salestrom lighting system. Each component requires a socket or plug connection. Thus, the Salestrom '841 patent does not contemplate connecting a wire to any component of its lighting system,

but instead requires a socket and plug connection. Therefore, the Salestrom '841 patent does not anticipate or render obvious independent claim 29.

Claims 30 – 36 and 39 – 40, being dependent upon independent claim 29, respectively, are also allowable for the above reasons. Moreover, these dependent claims recite additional features further distinguishing them over the cited patents, such as attaching a plurality of lamp holders of claim 30; linking at least two lamp holders via a lead wire of claim 31; and cutting a length of the lead wire required between each lamp holder of claim 33. Therefore, dependent claims 30 – 36 and 39 - 40 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited patents, particularly within the overall claimed combination.

In paragraphs 55 - 57, claims 37, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Salestrom '841 patent in view of Hatch (non-patent literature). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, since the Salestrom patent in view of the Hatch literature clearly do not disclose, teach or render obvious the subject matter of independent claim 29.

The Hatch reference is cited for disclosing a transformer having an electronic short circuit and over load protection. However, the Hatch reference does not cure the deficiencies noted above of the Salestrom patent with regard to independent claim 29. Therefore, the Salestrom patent and the Hatch reference do not disclose or render obvious the claimed features of Applicant's invention as recited in independent claim 29, or its respective dependent claims 37, 41 and 42.

In paragraph 58, claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Salestrom '841 patent in view of Hatch (non-patent literature) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 2,713,668 to Gibilisco. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, since the Salestrom patent in view of the Hatch literature and in further view of the Gibilisco patent clearly do not disclose, teach or render obvious the subject matter of independent claim.

The Hatch reference is cited for disclosing a transformer having an electronic short circuit and over load protection. The Gibilisco patent is cited for disclosing an electrical connector having a quick-release button. However, the Hatch reference and the Gibilisco patent do not cure the deficiencies of the Salestrom patent noted above with regard to

independent claim 29. Therefore, the Salestrom and Gibilisco patents and the Hatch reference do not disclose or render obvious the claimed features of Applicant's invention as recited in independent claim 29, or its respective dependent claim 38.

In paragraphs 59 - 54, claims 43, 44 and 46 - 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,283,612 to Hunter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, since the Hunter patent clearly does not disclose, teach or render obvious the subject matter of independent claim.

Independent claim 43 recites, inter alia, a method of servicing a luminaire assembly in which the lamp holder and the transformer are attached to the same area, and wires are released from and inserted in push-in wiring connections of the transformer and lamp holder.

The Hunter '612 patent discloses a light emitting diode light strip, as shown in FIG. 1, in which a hollow tube 20 (FIG. 2) houses a printed circuit board 22 (FIGS. 3 and 4). Plugs 62 connected to opposite ends of the tube 20 connect the tube to a connector of a power supply 64 or to a connector of another tube, as shown in FIG. 16. The wires connecting the plugs 62 to the tube 20 are not removable from the tube. Furthermore, the wires connected to the power supply 64 are not removable from the power supply. As shown in FIG. 15, the power supply 64 is not intended to be mounted in the same area as the hollow tube 20, as the power supply is mounted on the floor and the tube is mounted on the upper shelf of a cabinet.

The Hunter patent does not disclose the hollow tube and the power supply having removable supply and output wiring terminals from quick-release push-in wiring connections, as recited in independent claim 43. The hollow tube 20 of the Hunter patent does not have removable wires that are releasable therefrom, as recited in independent claim 43. End caps through which electrical wires pass into the hollow tube are secured to the hollow tube with a cement or adhesive to hermetically seal the tube. Col. 5, lines 30 - 46. Thus, the electrical wires are not removable from or insertable in the quick-release, push-in wiring connections in the hollow tube 20.

The power supply 64 of the Hunter patent also does not have removable wires that are releasable therefrom, as recited in independent claim 43. As shown in FIG. 1, neither of the electrical wires extending from the power supply 64 are removable from quick-release, push-in wiring connections in the power supply 64.

Therefore, the Hunter patent does not disclose or render obvious the claimed features of Applicant's invention as recited in independent claim 43.

Since the Hunter patent does not disclose or render obvious independent claim 43, their respective dependent claims 44 – 48 are also allowable for the above reasons. Moreover, these dependent claims recite additional features further distinguishing them over the cited patents, such as adjusting a position of one of the transformer and the lamp holder of claim 46; and removing or inserting a plurality of bulbs of claim 48. Therefore, dependent claims 44 – 48 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited patents, particularly within the overall claimed combination.

In paragraph 65, claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hunter '612 patent in view of Hatch (non-patent literature). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, since the Hunter patent in view of the Hatch literature clearly do not disclose, teach or render obvious the subject matter of independent claim 43.

The Hatch reference is cited for disclosing a transformer having an electronic short circuit and over load protection. However, the Hatch reference does not cure the deficiencies noted above of the Hunter patent with regard to independent claim 43. Therefore, the Hunter patent and the Hatch reference do not disclose or render obvious the claimed features of Applicant's invention as recited in independent claim 43, or its respective dependent claim 45.

In paragraphs 66 - 69, claims 54 - 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Salestrom '841 patent as applied to claim 53 above and in further view of Hatch (non-patent literature). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, since the Salestrom patent in view of the Hatch literature clearly do not disclose, teach or render obvious the subject matter of independent claim 49.

The Hatch reference is cited for disclosing a transformer having an electronic short circuit and over load protection. However, the Hatch reference does not cure the deficiencies noted above of the Salestrom patent with regard to independent claim 49. Therefore, the Salestrom patent and the Hatch reference do not disclose or render obvious the claimed


Application No. 10/617,041
Amendment Dated July 27, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 27, 2005

features of Applicant's invention as recited in independent claim 49, or its respective dependent claims 54 - 56.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendments and comments, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 - 6 and 8 - 56 are in condition for allowance. Prompt and favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Mr. R. Mickney", is written over a horizontal line.

Marcus R. Mickney
Reg. No. 44,941

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: JULY 27, 2005